

economic impact submitted to DOI on behalf of any Minnesota tribe was the Mille Lacs's letter by Sikorski and the Peat Marwick study.

1. Opposition Lobbying on Capitol Hill

a. Opponent Representatives Continue to Lobby Individual Congressmen

While lobbying Interior directly, opponents of the casino proposal continued to work other Hill leads. On Jan. 17, Kitto met with Sen. Thomas Daschle (D-S.D.) and a Daschle staffer in an attempt to get Daschle to write a letter to Secretary Babbitt opposing Hudson. In addition, Rep. Gunderson again wrote the Secretary on Jan. 25 to point out the “strong opposition” to the casino from people in Troy, and asked whether there was validity to the claim that “repeated expressions of opposition were ignored by the [BIA].”

In March, the opponents of the Hudson proposal began a campaign to get members of Congress to call the Secretary personally to express their opposition. On March 3, Ann Jablonski wrote a memorandum to Congressman Obey's district director imploring him to get Obey involved in the fight against the Hudson casino proposal. In response, Obey legislative assistant Paul Carver spoke to IGMS staffer Hartman and learned that the application was pending further comment by the opponents, that IGMS was “expected to make a recommendation on this to the Secretary in the next week or so,” and that it was therefore “an appropriate time for Obey to make his views known to the Department.”¹⁸⁶ After reading Carver's memo conveying that information, Obey wrote a letter that same day to Secretary Babbitt asking that he deny the application because it “would represent a very dangerous and troubling precedent.”

¹⁸⁶Memo from Paul Carver to David Obey, March 7, 1995.